THE OSCAN CURSE OF VIBIA

By Roland G. Kent

In 1876, in the excavations at ancient Capua, a rolled lead plate or tablet with an Oscan inscription was found. It was purchased by F. von Duhn, and by him presented to F. Bücheler, who had it unrolled and mounted in flat form, and after publication sent it to the Naples Museum, where it now is. The literature concerning it is as follows:

F. Bücheler, *Oskische Bleischrift* (Frankfurt a. M., 1877), which is a separate print from *Rheinisches Museum*, XXX (1878), 1–77; with a lithographic plate.

F. von Duhn, "Osservazione Campane," *Bulletino dell' Instituto di corrispondenza archeologica* (1878), p. 27.

M. Bréal, *Revue critique*, XII (1878), 89–92.

S. Bugge, "Die oskische Execrationsinschrift der Vibia," *Altitalische Studien*, I (Christiania, 1878), 1–60.

I. Zvetaieff, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Oscarum* (St. Petersburg and Leipzig, 1878), pp. 32–33, 152–53, with plate.

E. Huschke, *Die neue oskische Bleitafel* (Leipzig, 1880), pp. 1–75.

G. F. Gamurrini, Appendix, p. 930, to A. Fabretti, *Corpus Inscriptionum Italicarum antiquioris aevi* (Turin, 1867).

G. A. Schrumpf, "The Oscan Inscription Discovered at Capua in 1876," *Transactions of the Philological Society* (London, 1882–84), pp. 378–89.

O. A. Danielsson, in Pauli's *Altitalische Studien*, III (Hannover, 1884), 183–85.

I. Zvetaieff, *Inscriptiones Italiae Inferioris Dialectae* (Moscow and Leipzig, 1886), pp. 43–46.

W. Deecke, *Altitalische Vermuthungen*, pp. 181–82, which is included with the preceding as an Appendix.

C. Pascal, "La tavola osca di esecrazione," *Rendiconti della R. Accademia di archeologia lettere e belle arti di Napoli* (Nov. 21, 1894), pp. 1–26.

R. von Planta, *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte*, II (Strassburg, 1897), 515–16, 625–29.

R. S. Conway, *The Italic Dialects*, I (Cambridge, 1897), 124–28.

R. Wünsch, in *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum: Appendix continens defixionum tabulas in Attica regione repertas* (Berlin, 1897), Praef. xxiv.

F. Skutsch, adn. 1, to the preceding, Praef. xxiv.

A. Audollent, *Defixionum Tabellae* (Paris, 1904), pp. 257–68.

C. D. Buck, *Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (Boston, 1904), pp. 243–46.

Of all these, Bücheler and Bugge have done most for the interpretation of the text; Huschke was so erratic that only a few of his observations have value. Deecke has an independent translation, with a few new points, but added comparatively little. Pascal made one important discovery with regard to **VALAIMAS PUKLUM,** but that was about all he contributed. Conway and von Planta made new and painstaking examinations of the tablet, and their record is a valuable supplement to Bücheler's extremely accurate decipherment; von Planta added a convenient critical summary of previous studies. In convenient form, Audollent reprinted all previous essays at reading and interpretation, though with an occasional error therein. Buck recorded the reasonably certain results up to his time, and gave an independent judgment on them, with a few points of his own. The other publications have almost nothing of separate value.

The tablet, on being brought back into flat shape, showed one line of writing on the outer side, and twelve lines on the inside, all running from right to left. The tablet had been rolled in such a way that the beginnings of the lines were at the center of the roll; it is therefore the ends of the lines, or the left-hand side of the tablet, that have been destroyed by corrosion or by abrasion. The letters are in the Oscan alphabet, with minor irregularities in their forms; a number of words are misspelled, but some of the wrong letters were corrected on the tablet. The dotted **U** is found, but cannot be distinguished with certainty from the **U** without the dot, and it is necessary, with Bücheler and most editors, to disregard the distinction and write **U** in all instances. The **I** with the side stroke, which in the fully developed Oscan alphabet indicated an open *i*, is not used. The words are sometimes but not always separated by two dots or by a short vertical stroke.

It has been an alluring speculation, as I studied this inscription with successive classes of students, to essay the restoration of the ends of the lines, so that they should be of approximately equal length, and the meaning of the defective phrases and clauses should be completed. It is a hazardous attempt; others, notably Bugge, Huschke, Deecke, Pascal, have tried it, but I get different results, and therefore make bold to present them with the arguments on which they are based. My premise is that where the context did not indicate the

meaning of the missing words, formulaic repetition of other phrases in the tablet or the equivalents of phrases in other curse inscriptions should be utilized.

Despite the strictures of Bréal and of Huschke, Bücheler's work is the basis for all later studies and interpretations; and he did even better than he himself claims in his formal version of the text, with its translation into Latin, for in his commentary he made a considerable number of suggestions which he did not embody therein, though most of them have been accepted by later scholars. In my commentary, I shall endeavor to give credit first to him for all his readings and interpretations which are accepted, and also for those which have been used by later scholars as the foundation for improved versions; then to those who have corrected his errors or filled in his gaps, after which I plan to add my own small contribution. For convenience, I use the following typographical scheme: roman capitals, for letters clearly visible on the tablet; italic capitals, for letters more or less damaged, but visible in part; minuscules, for lost letters or restorations; asterisks, for lost letters, not restored; square brackets, to inclose wrongly inserted letters; italic capitals in pointed brackets, to show the corrections of miswritten letters; minuscules in pointed brackets, to show omitted letters.

When we look at the length of the lines, to see how much has been lost, we find that Bücheler thought line 3 complete by his restoration of **ARentikai inim,** and that line 6 was similarly complete with **PERF*A*kum herid nip;** also that 5 and 8 were complete with his interpretation, though he did not suggest the actual Oscan words. Now if we draw a vertical line on the tablet between **KERI** and **ARentikai** in 3, it will pass between (Bücheler's) **AKA** and **I** in 1, through **M** of **DAMI*A*** in 2, between **DU** and **NTEis** in 4, between **PUST** and **EISuk** in 5, through **R** of **PERF*A*** in 6, between **UFTE** and **IS** in 7, between **L** and **IMU** in 8, between **TURUMII** and **AD** in 9, between **PUKLUI** and **SUP*R*** in 10, between **HUNT** and **RU*SA*** in 11, between **TRUTA** and **S** in 12. For convenience, we count divided letters with the second half of the line. We find, then, that Bücheler added 13 or 14 letters after this dividing-line; Bugge added from 9 to 14; Huschke from 11 to 17; Deecke from 14 to 21, though we must judge mainly from a retranslation of his Latin version, since he gives no complete

Oscan text. With Pascal's discovery that the name **PAKIS KLUVATIIS,** in the proper case, always preceded **VALAIMAS PUKLU-,** all these versions had to be discarded, since the proper name had to stand at the ends of lines 3, 7, 11, before the **VALAIMAS PUKLU-** that began lines 4, 8, 12. Pascal's own version added from 10 to 30 letters after our vertical divider. Von Planta and Conway were not primarily interested in making a restoration of the missing portions, nor was Buck; but the last-named apparently considered line 3 complete with 24 letters after the division.

As has been noted by others, every fresh line begins with a new word, and the ends of the lines are not necessarily precisely even; but any blank space at the end of a line may be expected to be not more than the length of the next word which is to be written. On the other hand, a long word at the end of the line might be abbreviated, as **PUK** is in the middle of line 9. Furthermore, the letters are not all of equal width, nor are they written so that they average the same width; in the twelve lines, before our vertical division, there are, respectively, 58, 60, 60, 62, 61, 53, 60, 49, 58, 57, 56, 57 letters, if we take no account of interpuncts. This suggests a maximum variation of about 20 per cent in the number of letters after the division; if we omit lines 6 and 8, we find a variation only from 62 down to 56, or 10 per cent. To this, something might be added for the sake of the next word, if it was evidently too long for the remaining space. Pascal's variation of from 10 to 30 letters is manifestly impermissible.

I shall next take up, line by line, the reconstruction of the missing portion of the text, with due credit to previous workers; but I shall leave the actual interpretation of the meaning until later. In my reconstruction, the additions after the vertical divider vary from 35 or 34 letters, down to 27, a variation which is within the limits just set on mechanical grounds. I place most confidence in my restorations of lines 1, 3, 7, with 34, 31, 32 letters, respectively, after the division.

1 **KERI ARENTikai m*A*NAFUM PAI P*U*i [p*UI*[HERIAM SUVAM LEG*I*Num suvam af*LUKA-* *D* *P*akim kluvatiium valaimas puklum inim**

To and including the second **suvam,** the readings and restorations are quite certain, though the second **PUI** is dittographic; so Bücheler

(pp. 67–68). Deecke and Pascal set **suvam** in the place of the second **PUI,** and restore differently after **LEG*IN*um;** but the space is entirely inadequate for **suvam.** The last preserved characters of the line were read by Bücheler as **AKA** and a vertical hasta; by Bugge as **AKA*R*,** restoring **esAKA*R*atus aflukid;** by Huschke as **-UN LA-,** which may be passed by; by Deecke as **PAKIm kluvatiium inim;** by Pascal as **pakim kluvatiIUM Aflukad inim;** by Buck as **afl*AKAD*.** Von Planta and Conway venture no versions of their own.

Out of this tangled jungle, it is clear that, as Bugge saw, a verb for the relative clause is needed, and it is probably a form of **AFLUKAD,** which in line 3 immediately follows **LEGINUM,** and apparently governs that word as object; and that, as Deecke saw, the name of Pacius Cluatius should be found here, as chief object of the curse, before it occurs in the second line in a subordinate function. To this we may add the probability that the name of Pacius was followed, as Pascal first recognized, by the usual phrase **VALAIMAS PUKLU-,** and that, as Deecke first conjectured, an "and" followed it.

The testimony of others and of my own examination of the lithographic facsimile leads me to regard the characters remaining at the end of the line, as the lower part of an uncertain mark; a distinct **U** or **L;** a much miswritten and overwritten character, which may be almost anything, even a ligature of two letters; a distinct **A;** a vertical hasta with remnants of the other lines of **D;** the bottom parts of two vertical lines, which may well be a mutilated **P.** Thus we have **af*LUKAD* *P*akim** as a possibility, which accords with the other evidence and has been included in the restoration above, which contains 34 letters after the vertical dividing-line.

2 **USURS INIM MALAKS N<*E*>STRUS PAKIU<i> KLUVATIUI VALA<i>MA[I]S Puklui *ANTKADUM* DA- MI*A*d pesemad pai pui suvam heriam suvam**

The **I** of **NISTRUS** is probably a miswriting for **E;** cf. Buck, § 38, 4. The last character of **KLUVATIUI** is distinctly an **I,** though there is a gap between it and the interpunct, which caused Bücheler to read it as a mutilated **D.** Bugge took it to be an ablative, in an absolute phrase with **DAMI*A*ntud.** Huschke, Pascal, and Buck accept it as a dative. Von Planta is non-committal, though seeming to prefer

the dative to an ablative, which also is possible with a word meaning "nearer." Conway thought that he saw distinct traces of an **M** as the final letter. At any rate, **PAKIU** and **Puklu-** accord in case with **KLUVATIUI,** and **PAKIU** lacks a final letter. **VALAMAIS** lacks an **I** in the second syllable, as Bücheler saw, and has an extra **I** in the ultima, as Bugge recognized.

After this, Bücheler read ***ANIKADUM,*** with but the faintest trace of the ***D*** preserved. Bugge assumed that a crossbar had been lost in the third character, and read ***ANT KADUM,*** in which he is followed by Deecke and by Pascal. Huschke divided ***ANIKAD UM.*** Von Planta follows Bücheler, admitting the possibility of ***T.*** Conway could see only three vertical hastas, followed by **K***M.** Buck reads **AN*T*K*A*DUM** as one word.

At the end of the line, as Bugge and Deecke recognized, **suvam** should stand, modifying the **LEGINUM** which begins the third line. In fact, the **LEGINUM AFLUKAD** of line 3 suggest that we have a repetition of the relative clause which stands in the first line, with **suvam** before its nouns instead of after, as in the single line on the outside of the tablet.

Space is left for two words, part of the first being preserved. Bugge proposed **DAM*I*Antud,** *demeante;* Huschke, **DAMI*A*tum,** *subactum;* Deecke, **DAMI*A*d,** *domet;* Pascal, **DAMI<ai>*H*eriid,** *Damiae velit;* von Planta, **DAMI*A*i,** *Damiae;* Buck, **DAMI*A*-,** "damnum." I suggest **DAMI*A*d pesemad,** an ablatival phrase of manner; for the phrase, cf. Livy xxii. 53. 11: *tum me Iuppiter . . . . pessimo leto adficiat.* This gives 33 letters after the vertical.

3 **LEGINUM AFLUKAD IDIK TFEI MANAFUM VIBIIAI PREBAIAM PUkULUM DAdaD KERI ARentikai manafum pakim kluvatiium**

I have adopted Bücheler's suggestion for the uncertain **PREBAIAMPU*ULUM,** in which he is followed by Huschke and by Deecke. Bugge proposed **PREBAI AMPUIULUM,** which is adopted by von Planta and by Buck. Pascal suggests **PREBAIAM PUz ULUM.** Bücheler's **DAdaD** is followed by all but Huschke and Pascal, who give **DAdiD.**

Bücheler's **ARentikai** is certain, and is accepted by all. Pascal recognized that the **VALAIMAS PUKLUM** at the beginning of

line 4 required a **PAKIM KLUVATIIUM** at the end of line 3, which is accepted by later editors. Huschke felt the need of a verb in the gap at the end of this line, with *mando* as its meaning; von Planta suggested the need of a verb meaning *devoveo*, in the same place; Buck thought that the equivalent of *mandavi* was to be implied. One is inclined to ask why it should not be set in the text. **MANAFUM** gives this meaning, and with its insertion, there are just 31 letters after our vertical divider.

4 **VALAIMAS PUKLUM INIM ULAS LEGINEI SVAI NEIP DADID LAMATIR AKRID EISEIS DU- NTEis kurups sulum inim dumatir**

All editors have recognized that the obvious completion of **DUNTE** is by adding **is,** making, according to nearly all, a genitive singular; but they interpret the word variously. After this a subject is needed for the verbs, as Bugge first observed, suggesting the equivalent of Latin *cinis;* Pascal thought that it might be a word meaning *corpus.* The latter view I have adopted, making a hypothetical Oscan word, equivalent phonologically to Latin *corpus;* for the use of *corpus* in curses, see M. Jeanneret, *La langue des tablettes d'exécration latines* (Paris and Neuchâtel, 1918), page 109. The line is however not yet filled out by some 15 to 20 letters, if we may judge from the previous lines. A reasonable conjecture is a word meaning "all," modifying ***kurups,** and an additional verb, with the conjunction "and." I have thought of ***dumatir,** which rhymes with **LAMATIR** and alliterates with **DUNTEis,** even as the two verbs in the next line rhyme and alliterate with each other. With this, the portion of the line after the vertical amounts to 27 letters.

5 **INIM KAISPATAR Inim KRUSTATAR SVAI NEIP AVT SVAI TIIUM IDIK FIFIKUS PUST EISuk pun kahad svemnum avt diirnum**

Thus Bücheler, inclusive of **EISuk,** after which he wished to restore an infinitive meaning *fieri.* Bugge, taking **TIIUM** as accusative, favored **PUST EISui** with an infinitive equal to *facere,* "that you will do this afterward to him"; wherein the dative **EISui** should, as von Planta points out, more probably be **EISei.** Huschke has **EISeis.**

Deecke, Pascal, and von Planta favor **EISuk.** Deecke, restoring **NuhtiRNUM** in the next line, proposed the equivalent of *somnum diurnum* at the end of this line. In view of the **AVT NuhtiRNUM** in 6, to which a contrast must be sought, this seems a very satisfactory conjecture, essentially. If we are to seek Oscan equivalents for the two words, we may make phonetically ***svemnum** = *somnum* from **swepnom*, and **diirnum* after **NuhtiRNUM,** the doubtful quality of which is somewhat lessened by its probable occurrence in line 12. ***Diirnum** and **nuhtirnum** rhyme even as do *diurnus* and *nocturnus*, and have the ending of *hibernus, vernus, veternus, modernus, hodiernus, hesternus*, and other adjectives of time. I take **PUST EISuk,** however, as referring to the preceding clauses, and therefore do not restore an infinitive, but conjecture

pun kahad svemnum avt diirnum | AVT NuhtiRNUM,

with repetition of the **PUN KAHAD** before the second **AVT.** This restoration gives 30 letters in the fifth line, after our vertical divider.

6 **PUN KAHAD AVT NuhtiRNUM NEIP PUTIIAD PUNUM KAHAD AVT SVAI PID PE- RFAkium kahad pust eisuk fakium neip**

The interpuncts in **PUTII:AD** were recognized as wrong by Bücheler, and those in **PUN:UM** by Bréal, whose lead all later editors have followed, except Huschke, who apparently did not know the work of Bréal nor that of Bugge. For the fourth word of the line, Bugge conjectured **NeneRNUM,** *virilitate carens;* Huschke made a very wild guess; Deecke suggested **NuhtiRNUM,** which commends itself to me, though other editors since Deecke have held aloof. At the end of the line, Bücheler suggested **PERFAkum** or **PERFAkium herid neip;** Bugge, **PERFAhtum id ni;** Huschke, **PERFAkum kahad neip;** Deecke, in Latin translation, *perfi(cere vult, ne)*; Pascal, **PERFAhtum id neip.** Von Planta remarks that a present subjunctive or a future indicative is needed in the **SVAI** clause, but otherwise agrees essentially with Bücheler; so also does Buck. My restoration follows Bücheler in the main, but accepts Huschke's **kahad,** which is a subjunctive and occurs in other clauses, and inserts **pust eisuk** in imitation of **PUST EISuk** of line 5, where it stands immediately after

a **SVAI** clause, and then an infinitive depending on the **PUTIIAD** of 7. 7. This makes 31 letters after the vertical divider.

7 **PUTIIAD NIP HUnTRUIS NIP SUPRUIS AISUSIS PUTIIANS PIDUM PUTIIANS UFTE- IS UD*F*akium nestrus pakiui kluvatiui**

The text, inclusive of **UD*F***, is that of Bücheler, who recognized that **PUTIIANS** requires a plural subject from some source and an infinitive in the gap at the end of the line. The infinitive seems to most editors to lurk in **UD*F***, of which Bugge makes **UD*F*akium** *odefacere, olfacere;* Deecke makes **UD*F*akum** *valere;* Pascal makes **UD*F*akium** *proficere*. The last of these seems best. Bugge and Huschke found the subject in **AISUSIS;** Deecke divided **AISUS IS,** *sacrificia eius,* and made **AISUS** the subject of the first **PUTIIANS,** and **UFTEis** the subject of the second. Pascal follows Deecke, but regards **AISUSIS** as a single word. Von Planta finds the subject in **NISTRUS** of line 2, or in the gap; Buck indicates an ellipsis of *propinqui,* which would be **nistrus.** Writing it, however, in the correct spelling, I insert **nestrus,** and follow it with **pakiui kluvatiui,** which, as Pascal recognized, must come at the end of the line before the **VALAIMAS PUKLUI** of 8. I regard the second **PUTIIANS** as a mere repetition, since **PIDUM** and other forms of this compound, which occurs also in the Tabula Bantina and in the Cippus Abellanus, always have indefinite meaning, not subordinating; and a subordinate clause here, "whatever they may be able <to do>," would lack appropriateness. The restorations give the line 32 letters after the dividing vertical.

8 **VALAIMAS PUKLUI PUN FAR KAHAD NIP PUTIIAD EDUM NIP MENVUM L- IMU<m> PIdum putiiad sulum eisunk paflum**

Here the meaning of the missing part is simple. Bücheler, for **PI** and the lost words, gave *durch irgend eines der Mittel,* **PAI HUMUNS BIVUS KARANTER,** the last four words being those commencing the next line. Bugge put this into Oscan as **PIdum eisunk,** etc., with **PIdum** as ablative. Huschke suggested **P*A*fluis perum,** "by the foods [cf. Latin *pabulum*] through which . . . ."; but **perum,** which he

wishes to govern **PAI** in the next line, means "without."[1] Deecke, Pascal, von Planta, and Buck all approve Bücheler's meaning, with or without accepting Bugge's text precisely. It remains only to fill out the whole gap, the length of which has been pretty definitely determined by lines 1, 3, 7; I suggest the restoration above, in which the subjunctive is repeated in the second part of the main clause, and the adjective "all" and a neuter substantive for "foods" are added. For the last word, I utilize Huschke's conjecture, since no Oscan word of this meaning actually occurs. This makes 32 letters after the dividing-line.

9 **PAI HUMUNS BIVUS KARANTER SULUH PAKIS KLUVATIIS VALAIM<a>S PUK TURUMII- AD Luvfrum idik estud inim prufum**

Bücheler recognized the **L** at the edge of the tablet, with what might be a **U** somewhat below; this latter letter might, as he himself noted, belong rather to the last preserved word of line 10. Its position, according to the lithographed plate, indicates that the latter supposition is correct. Bugge proposed **Luvfrum,** which he connected with the dative **VIBIIAI AKVIIAI** of line 10, comparing the formula ἐμοὶ δὲ ὅσια καὶ ἐλεύθερα εἴη πάντως of the curse-tablets of Cnidos.[2] Huschke accepted this general sense, but Deecke made another restoration, *id perficias,* which is unacceptable. Pascal restored **L*U*vfrum idik estud,** taking the letter after **L** with this line. Von Planta mentions the restoration **Luvfrum,** apparently with approval, and Buck accepts the meaning *liberum . . . . sit.* I accept Pascal's extension of Bugge's **Luvfrum,** and add a second adjective, to correspond with the two adjectives of the Greek formula. The restoration above contains 28 letters after the vertical divider.

10 **VIBIIAI AKVIIAI SVAI PUH AFLAKUS PAKIM KLUVATIIUM VALAIMAS PUKLU<*M*> SUP*R*us teras tuvai heriai sakrim**

This line has resisted editors better than the preceding lines. Bugge took the dubious character which Pascal associated with the line above, as a mutilated **R,** belonging to this line, where **R** is cer-

[1] Tabula Bantina, ll. 5, 14, 21.

[2] A. Audollent, *Defixionum Tabellae,* pp. 5–19.

tainly needed after **SUP-.** Bugge saw also that the **HUNTRUS TERAS,** as he divided the letters in the next line, gave a clue to this phrase, and suggested **SUP*R*us,** *ad superos,* followed by a genitive meaning *caeli* or the like. Huschke took **HUNTRUSTERAS** as one word, meaning *unterweltlich,* and restored **SUP*R*usteras,** *oberweltlicht.* Deecke's version, *supra terram,* implies a text **SUP*R*us teras.** Pascal's **SUP*R*uis** is not so good, as the two **SVAI PUH** clauses imply parallelism of phrasing as far as possible. Von Planta and Buck accept the meaning *supra* as probable, which implies **SUP*R*us.**

From the parallelism of the clauses we may accept **SUP*R*us teras.** As **LEG*I*Num** was preceded by **HERIAM** in line 1, where Ceres Arentica was subject to the verb, it is reasonable to infer that such was the situation here, where line 11 has **TUVAI LEGINEI;** hence, I restore **tuvai heriai** in the gap at the end of line 10. Further, in **INIM TUVAI LEGINEI INIM SAKRIM,** the second **INIM** seems but a repetition, hard to interpret in any logical way. Omitting it, we have **TUVAI LEGINEI SAKRIM** in 11 after **INIM,** "and"; this suggests not merely **tuvai heriai** in 10, but **tuvai heriai sakrim,** which satisfactorily fills the gap after **SUP*R*us teras,** giving 28 letters after the vertical division.

11 **INIM TUVAI LEGINEI [INIM] SAKRIM SVAI PUH AFLAKUS HUNTRUS TERAS HUNT- RU*S* Apas sakrim pakim kluvatiium**

As has just been said, the second **INIM** is probably dittographic. **HUNTRUS TERAS** seems to be the correct word division. Bücheler rejected this possibility because he was unable to explain **HUNTRUS** as a preposition; he divided **HUNTRU STERAS,** and was equally unable to explain **STERAS.** Huschke made one word of **HUNTRUSTERAS,** as was noted; but Bugge divided **HUNTRUS TERAS,** and interpreted *ad inferos terrae,* in which he was followed by Pascal. Deecke, following Bugge's division, rendered *infra terram,* in which he is followed by von Planta and by Buck, though an uncertainty remains whether **TERAS** is genitive singular or accusative plural. After this, Bücheler read **HUNTRU SA**;** Bugge suggested **HUNTRU*S* Apasum,** *ad inferos aquarum,* which is followed by Pascal, and approved, with reserves, by von Planta. Huschke's **HUNTRUSAkrim** is hardly ac-

ceptable; nor is Deecke's **HUNTRUis sAkrim,** even though the *S* is nearly obliterated, for the space does not suffice for three letters.

To me, it seems natural that after **HUNTRUS TERAS** we should have **HUNTRUS Apas,** rather than **Apasum,** with **Apas** in the same number as **TERAS.** This might be followed by **sakrim** as in the alternative clause. Finally, because of the initial words in line 12, we must restore **pakim kluvatiium.** The two **SVAI PUH** clauses now run parallel, but the second lacks the datives **tuvai heriai . . . . INIM TUVAI LEGINEI,** and contains two **HUNTRUS** phrases instead of one; the first clause has **SAKRIM** twice, the second has it once; the first contains the personal name immediately after the verb, the second has it at the end. There are 28 letters after the vertical division.

12 **VALAIMA[I]S PUKLU<m> AVT KERI ARE<n>Tikai** *AVT*
ULAS LEGINEI *NUHTIRNAS* **TRUTA- S TUSz fuid pakis**
kluvatiis valaimas puk

The failure to write the final **m** of **PUKLU,** and the omission of the fourth letter of **ARE<n>Tikai** were noted by Bücheler; the erroneous insertion of the **I** in the final syllable of **VALAIMAIS** was recognized by Bugge. Huschke emended to **PUKLU<i>,** but otherwise these corrections have been accepted by all editors.

The fragmentary letters after **LEGINEI** were read by Bücheler as probably *NUH*IRNAS,* with the third, sixth, and last two fairly certain. For the fourth, he suggested **E** or **V;** the remnant of this letter and of the following **I** might together form a mutilated **P.** Yet as he states the visible part to be only the upper right part of an **E** or **V,** I feel justified in adopting Bugge's *NUHTIRNAS.* Pascal also follows Bugge in this point, but reads only **UHTIRNAS.* Others read but a few scattered letters.

The restoration at the end of the line depends upon the interpretation of the preceding words and their division into phrases and sentences. In connection with line 11, I have expressed a belief that the second **SVAI PUH** clause ended with **PUKLU.** Certainly, with Ceres Arentika addressed in the second person as subject to the verb, the dative of her name in 12 could not properly be the indirect object, but must be included in the next clause or sentence. Hereafter comes a genitive, perhaps expressing the time within which. A verb is needed, and we have but **TUS;** restoration can be only free and fanciful. **TUS** may be **TUSz** = Latin *tostus,* and the rest follows easily, with the

nominative **puk** abbreviated as in line 9. This makes 35 lines after the vertical divider; but **valaimas** may be abbreviated by the omission of the last vowel, as in line 9, or even to **val,** or the last few letters may have been crowded to avoid running over into the next line.

An alternative restoration for line 11 seems worth chronicling. The second **SVAI PUH** clause may have ended with **HUNTRUS Apas,** or the final words may have been **HUNTRU SAkrim,** with the **HUNTRU** a mere dittography. After this, there may have been **manafum,** with its object and the two datives, the sentence ending with **LEGINEI.** The last sentence, in 12, I reconstruct as before. With this text, line 11 would have 29 or 30 letters after the vertical division.

Of all these additions to complete the lines, very few are without the authority of previous editors or of formulaic repetition. I can fairly claim the credit or be charged with the blame of **DAMI*Ad* pesemad** 2, **inim domatir** 4, **TUSz fuid** 12, along with the filler **sulum** in 4 and 8, but with no more than these. Further, the length of the lines, in number of letters before and after the vertical division, is as follows:

Line	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Letters before	58	60	60	62	61	53	60	49	58	57	56	57
Letters after	34	33	31	27	30	31	32	32	28	28	28	35

The single line on the outside of the tablet may be thus restored:

KERI ARENTIK*A*i mn PAI PUI SUV*A* *H*eriam suva LEGINum aflukad
lamatir KRUS- tatar pakis kluvatiis valaimas puk

In this, I have myself added **mn,** to fill properly the gap at that point, as abbreviation of **MANAFUM,** and the name at the end, as subject to the last two verbs. Bugge inserted the second **suva** and **aflukid lamatir;** I have improved to **aflukad.** The remainder stands to Bücheler's credit. The possessive adjective lacks the final **m** of the accusative, like **LIMU** 8 and **PUKLU** 12 on the other side. There are 31 letters after the vertical division, which falls after **KRUS-,** and 60 before it.

I desire now to present my complete text of the inscription, with a Latin version; the division into phrases and clauses will be shown by the punctuation of the Latin. I would give also some general considerations with regard to the meaning, followed by a complete rendering into English, since Latin versions of difficult dialect inscriptions are often almost as hard to understand as the originals; and then I would conclude this already too lengthy commentary with such notes on special words as may be desirable to justify my rendering.

OSCAN TEXT

1 KERI ARENTikai mANAFUM PAI PUi [pUI] HERIAM SUVAM LEGINum
suvam afLUKA- D Pakim kluvatiium valaimas puklum inim
2 USURS INIM MALAKS N<E>STRUS PAKIU<i> KLUVATIUI VALA<i>MA[I]S
Puklui ANTKADUM DA- MIAd pesemad pai pui suvam heriam suvam
3 LEGINUM AFLUKAD IDIK TFEI MANAFUM VIBIIAI PREBAIAM PUkULUM
DAdaD KERI ARentikai manafum pakim kluvatiium
4 VALAIMAS PUKLUM INIM ULAS LEGINEI SVAI NEIP DADID LAMATIR
AKRID EISEIS DU- NTEis kurups sulum inim dumatir
5 INIM KAISPATAR Inim KRUSTATAR SVAI NEIP AVT SVAI TIIUM
IDIK FIFIKUS PUST EISuk pun kahad svemnum avt diirnum
6 PUN KAHAD AVT NuhtiRNUM NEIP PUTIIAD PUNUM KAHAD AVT
SVAI PID PE- RFAkium kahad pust eisuk fakium neip
7 PUTIIAD NIP HUnTRUIS NIP SUPRUIS AISUSIS PUTIIANS PIDUM
PUTIIANS UFTE- IS UDFakium nestrus pakiui kluvatiui
8 VALAIMAS PUKLUI PUN FAR KAHAD NIP PUTIIAD EDUM NIP
MENVUM L- IMU<m>PIDum putiiad sulum eisunk paflum
9 PAI HUMUNS BIVUS KARANTER SULUH PAKIS KLUVATIIS VALAIM<a>S
PUK TURUMII- AD Luvfrum idik estud inim prufum
10 VIBIIAI AKVIIAI SVAI PUH AFLAKUS PAKIM KLUVATIIUM
VALAIMAS PUKLU<M> SUPRus teras tuvai heriai sakrim
11 INIM TUVAI LEGINEI [INIM] SAKRIM SVAI PUH AFLAKUS HUNTRUS
TERAS HUNT- RUS Apas sakrim pakim kluvatiium
12 VALAIMA[I]S PUKLU<m> AVT KERI ARE<n>Tikai AVT ULAS LEGINEI
NUHTIRNAS TRUTA- S TUSz fuid pakis kluvatiis valaimas puk

LATIN VERSION

Cereri Ultrici mandavi—quae qui [qui] vim suam, cohortem suam adferat—Pacium Cluatium Valaemae filium et osores et malevolos propinquos Pacio Cluatio Valaemae filio, ut-cadant nece pessima—quae qui suam vim, suam cohortem adferat—id tibi mandavi. Vibiae Prebaeam puellam reddat: Cereri Ultrici mandavi Pacium Cluatium Valaemae filium et illius cohorti, si non reddiderit. Caesum sit acriter eius devoti corpus totum et domitum sit et caespitibus tegitor et crustator, si non (reddiderit). At si tu id decreveris, post ea cum paret somnum aut diurnum cum paret aut nocturnum, ne possit, quandoque paret. At si quid perficere paret, post ea facere ne possit. Neque inferis neque superis sacrificiis possint, quicquam possint optati efficere propinqui Pacio Cluatio Valaemae filio. Cum far paret, neve possit edere, neve minuere famem quoquam possit omnium eorum pabulorum quae homines vivi vescuntur. Omnino Pacius Cluatius Valaemae fil. torqueatur: liberum id esto et probum Vibiae Acuviae. Sive attuleris Pacium Cluatium Valaemae filium supra terram tuae vi hostiam et tuae cohorti [et] hostiam, sive attuleris infra terram infra aquam hostiam Pacium Cluatium Valaemae filium, aut Cereri Ultrici aut illius cohorti intra noctem quartam tostus fuerit Pacius Cluatius Valaemae fil.

Some general considerations are of importance for this rendering. The curse is addressed to Ceres Arentica, a nether-world goddess of vengeance, by one Vibia Acuvia, against Pacius Cluatius, "son of Valaema," for a theft, and is to be effective if he does not give back the stolen object; so much is clear, and other matters of detail will be discussed under the separate words. Ceres is now addressed in the second person, now spoken of in the third; witness the changes from the one to the other in the first and the last sentences. Vibia speaks now in the first person (**MANAFUM** 1, 3), now in the third (**VIBIIAI** 3, 10); unless we are to take **MANAFUM** as spoken by a professional sorcerer or sorceress, composing the curse on behalf of Vibia, which I regard as a distinct possibility.

The sentences are, as is natural, expressed in a rather incoherent way, yet can be reduced to a reasonable succession of thoughts. The first sentence ends with **MANAFUM** 3, for **IDIK** refers to the preceding (see note below); the repeated relative clause of purpose is more or less parenthetical, to call attention to the form of the activity of the avenging goddess. The second sentence consists of a summons for restitution, and an imprecation, if restitution is not made; the conditional clause is distinctly needed at its end. The third sentence gives that which is desired for Pacius, if he does not make return of the stolen object; it also distinctly needs the condition. Further, if the abbreviated **SVAI NEIP** of 5 be taken with the following, we have two "if" clauses which are not logical alternatives, and are connected by **AVT,** which apparently means "or" in this inscription, but only as correlative to another **AVT** (on this point, cf. details below).

The fourth sentence begins with **AVT SVAI TIIUM FIFIKUS,** as a mark of deference to the avenging goddess, and goes on with the sufferings which Pacius is to have before he is ultimately done to death and buried, as was asked in the third sentence. He may neither sleep nor accomplish anything nor eat with satisfaction; his relatives may not be able to avail him by sacrifices. The sentence divisions are clear, down to line 10; here it becomes a problem whether the two **SVAI PUH AFLAKUS** clauses are to be attached to the preceding or to the following. I have taken them with the following, because the last sentence then becomes a summary of the whole curse: "In

whichever fashion thou shalt lay him low, let Pacius be withered away [**TUSz**] within the fourth night."

The following, accordingly, would be my rendering into English:

(1) To Ceres the Avenger have I consigned—(to the one) who, female (or) male, shall direct her force, her host (thereto)—Pacius Cluatius child of
(2) the Valaema, and (2) (my) haters and ill-wishers, kinsmen to Pacius Cluatius child of the Valaema, to perish by the worst destruction—who,
(3) female (or) male, shall direct her force, (3) her host (thereto)—this (task) have I consigned to thee. To Vibia let her surrender up the child Prebaea; to Ceres the Avenger have I consigned Pacius Cluatius
(4) (4) child of the Valaema and to her host, if he does not surrender her. Let the whole body of this doomed man be lashed severely, and
(5) overpowered, (5) and let it be covered with sods, and buried, if (he does) not. Moreover if thou hast made this decision, after this, when
(6) he makes ready for sleep either by day, (6) when he makes ready (for sleep) or by night, let him not be able (to sleep), whenever he makes ready (for it). Moreover if he makes ready to accomplish anything,
(7) after this let him not be able to do (it). (7) Neither by sacrifices to (the gods) below nor (by sacrifices to the gods) above let them be able, let the kinsmen be able to achieve anything desirable for Pacius
(8) Cluatius (8) child of the Valaema. When he makes bread ready, let him not be able to eat, nor let him be able to lessen (his) hunger by
(9) any of all those foods (9) which living men feed upon. In every way let Pacius Cluatius child of the Valaema be tortured; (but) free let this be,
(10) and fair, (10) for Vibia Acuvia. Whether thou shalt have directed Pacius
(11) Cluatius child of the Valaema above earth (as) victim to thy force, (11) and (as) victim to thy host, or thou shalt have directed under the earth,
(12) under the water, (as) victim Pacius Cluatius (12) child of the Valaema, either by Ceres the Avenger or by her host, within the fourth night, shriveled away be Pacius Cluatius child of the Valaema.

It remains now to give such commentary on the separate words as seems desirable, so far as this has not been done in other connections. For convenience, the words will be discussed in their first occurrence, whether that be in the preserved or in the restored portion of the tablet.

1. **m*A*NAFUM:** *mandavi*, with Bü. vPl. Con. Bk.; Bg. *mandavimus*, H. *subreptum*, De. Pa. *mando*.

1. **HERIAM . . . . LEG*I*Num:** *vim* Pa. Bk., and *cohortem* Bg. Bk. Others vary considerably, though within a limited range. The

interpretation here taken is that **HERIA-** denotes the personal activity of Ceres herself, while the **LEGIN-** is her host of subordinate spirits, to whom she may delegate her work of vengeance. Thus, where Ceres is subject (**af*LUKAD*** 1, **AFLUKAD** 3, **AFLAKUS** 10, 11), the **HERIA-** and the **LEGIN-** are both named; but the **HERIA-** is omitted where Ceres and the **LEGIN-** are directly associated by an "and" (3–4) or by an "or" (12).

1. **af*LUKAD*** (and **AFLUKAD** 3, **AFLAKUS** 10, 11): Bü. *deferre;* Bg. *adigere;* H. *affligere;* De. *abripere;* Pa. *deferre, immittere;* Con. **ablegere, abducere;* Bk. *afferre.* Though Bugge, followed by Pascal, takes it as governing a direct object of the person and another accusative without a preposition, as a goal, it seems rather to be one of those verbs which may take either of two ideas as direct object, the remaining one being expressed by a dative or by an ablative or by a prepositional phrase. Cf. *circumdet bracchia collo,* Ov. *Met.* ix. 459, and *collum circumdare filo,* Cat. lxiv. 377; *ossibus implicet ignem,* Verg. *Aen.* i. 660, and *crinem implicat auro, Aen.* iv. 148; and also the usages with *donare, abstergere, detergere,* and in many verbs where the relation is virtually mutual, as in Cicero's witticism ap. Macr. *Sat.* ii. 3. 3, *quis generum meum ad gladium adligavit?* Thus in 1 and 3 **HERIAM** and **LEGINUM** seem to be the objects of **AFLUKAD,** but **PAKIM KLUVATIIUM** is the object of **AFLAKUS** in 10 and in 11. The dative **LEGINEI** in 11 indicates a transference of the direct object of 1 and of 3 to the function of the indirect object. The most probable etymology, accordingly, is that it contains the equivalents of Latin *ad* and *flecto;* cf. Buck § 97*a*, § 139. 1, and *Vokalismus d. osk. Spr.*, page 116, also Bugge, pages 14–15, whose argument makes for *ad* rather than for *ab* as prior element.

1. **pakim:** Bü. Bg. H. De. Pa. render as "Paquius"; vPl. Con. Bk. as "Pacius," which is obviously preferable. Cf. W. Schulze, *Gesch. latein. Eigennamen,* page 204.

1. **kluvatiium:** the normalized Latin form of this name would seem to be "Cluatius"; so Bü. Bg. H. Pa. But De. has "Cluvatius," and Pl. and Bk. have "Clovatius." Cf. Schulze, *op. cit.*, page 483, and Pauly-Wissowa, *Realenc. d. kl. Alt., s.v.* "Cloatius." The gens is known also from the *jovila*-inscriptions of Capua.

1. **valaimas puklum:** found six times, in various cases, in the pre-

served part of the tablet. Bü. *Di Manes;* Bg. *Optimae purgamentum;* H. *valetudinis percussus* (!)*;* De. *Persephonae piaculum;* Pa. *Valemae filius,* virtually accepted by vPl. Bk.; Con. *optimae puerorum* = the Furies. Bücheler took **VALAIMAS** as nom. acc. dat.-abl. ,[1] meaning "best," as shown by *valaemo-* in the Tabula Bantina, with either an appositive or a genitive of the whole, meaning "children," this word being either neuter like Greek τέκνον or epicene like Latin *puer* in early times; he took the phrase, then, as a euphemism for a set of infernal demons, cf. Εὐμενίδες, "Kindly Ones" = the Furies. Bugge propounded the view, accepted by all later editors but Conway, that **VALAIMAS** is a genitive, depending on the other word. **VALAIMAS** means, then, "of Valaema," as a proper name, or "of the Best One," euphemistic for Persephone. **PUKLU-,** which even Bücheler took to mean "child," comparing Latin *puer,* was taken by Bugge and by Deecke to mean an atonement offering, with the root as in *purus* and *putus,* "clean." The alternatives seem to be "son of Valaema" and "atonement offering to Persephone." The direct equation of **PUKLU-** with Sanskrit *putrá-,* "son," not made by Bücheler, but made in 1879 by G. Curtius in *Grundzüge d. griech. Etym.*[5], page 287, is convincing, in view of the occurrences of the word in other Italic dialects. Yet to take *Valaema,* with Pascal, as the name of Pacius' mother, is astonishing. The relative clauses in the Greek curse from Cumae,[2] which Pascal cites, are hardly precise parallels: Οὐαλερίαν Κοδράτιλλαν ἣν ἔτεκεν Οὐαλερία Εὔνοια ἣν ἔσπειρε Οὐαλέριος Μυστικός; and so far as I am aware, we have no other definition of an Italian by his mother's name. The name *Valaema,* or the Latin *Optima,* is not known as a praenomen, though, as Pascal points out, both gentilicia such as *Valerius* and cognomina such as *Vala* and *Valens* are found from this root.[3] In view of these peculiarities, may it rather be that Vibia calls him, by prolepsis, "child of the Queen of the Dead," to indicate where she would like him to be, that is, with his mother, and accordingly dead? Only the Queen of Hell could have such a villain for a son! Cf. such derogatory expressions in English as "devil's brood," "devil's spawn," "son of perdition," "son of a bitch."

[1] Cf. *DEVAS CORNISCAS, CIL,* I[1], 814 = 1[2], 975.

[2] Audollent, p. 272.

[3] Cf. Schulze, *op. cit.,* p. 376.

2. **USURS INIM MALAKS:** Bü. *-orus et mollis*, nom. sg., cf. μαλακός; he considered and rejected the possibility of the acc. pl. Bréal, Con. *uxores et . . . .*; Bg. vPl. Bk. *osores et malevolos*; H. *miser et malacus;* De. Pa. *mulieres et liberos.* The one word is to be equated with Latin *osor* or with *uxor;* the other with *malus* extended by a suffix, or with the Greek given above. I incline to Bugge's interpretation.

3. **NISTRUS,** for **N*E*STRUS:** Bü. Pa. *propiores*, whence De. vPl. Bk. *propinquos;* Bg. Con. *nostros;* H. *nutans.* Bücheler is certainly right in taking it as a comparative to the superlative *nessimo-*, *proximus*, which motivates the next words syntactically.

2. ***ANTKA*DUM:** Bg. Con. vPl. *ante cadere;* De. *ut cadant;* Pa. *antea mactari;* Bk. *occidionem;* Bü. makes no attempt at interpretation, and H. divides **ANIKAD UM,** *contingat; igitur.* Nearly all take it as infinitive of purpose; the prefix may or may not be a separate word, but in either instance conveys the idea *zur Vergeltung*, as Deecke pointed out.

2. **DAMI*A*d:** the restorations are very various, though most of them rest on the root seen in Greek δαμα-, which, as Deecke noted, was used *häufig vom Tode;* the same root is in Latin *domare.* I take the word as an ablative of means or of manner, with an Oscan equivalent of Latin *pessimus* as an adjunct, though this word is not actually found in the Italic dialects.

3. **IDIK:** forms of this pronoun in Oscan denote "the aforesaid," except when followed immediately by an explanatory relative clause. I therefore take it, with Bü. and others, but against Bg. and H., to refer to the idea expressed in the preceding.

3. **PREBAIAMPU*ULUM:** so on the tablet, without signs of word-division; Bü., followed by H. De. Con., **PREBAIAM PUkULUM**; Bg., followed by vPl. Bk., **PREBAI AMPUIULUM;** Pa. **PREBAIAM PUz ULUM,** *oblationes ut sepulcrorum.* The choice is between Bücheler's text and Bugge's. The latter takes the second word as cognate to Latin *anculus*, Greek ἀμφίπολος, with a diminutive suffix, and translates by *ministrum*, which is accepted by von Planta and by Buck; but in **PREBAI** he finds a perfect participle passive, agreeing with **VIBIIAI,** and meaning *spoliatae*, a quite untenable view. One would rather take it as a cognomen of Vibia, and, after von Planta, I, 348, 485, equate it with Greek πρέσβυς; but Vibia

is provided with another name in 10, and cognomina are rare in Oscan. Women probably did not have them at all. Could **PREBAI** be an adverb "at once"? Yet this implies that the **E** stands, in defiance of Oscan phonetics, for the diphthong *ai*, and must be regretfully abandoned.

Bücheler, dividing **PREBAIAM PUkULUM,** thought of associating **PREBAIAM** with the neuter plural *prebaia* (Gloss of Cyrillus; to which Deecke added *praebia remedia* from Paul Fest. 235 M., cf. 234; cf., also, Varro *LL.* vii. 107), whence he got the meaning "amulet," and suggested **VIBIIAI PREBAIAM,"** [but] protection to Vibia," to avert any evil reaction from the preceding curse, as in Προσοδίοι δὲ ὅσια of a Cnidian tablet (Audollent, p. 12). Yet the brevity of the following sentence, reduced to two words, is against this. Bücheler suggested now that **PUkULUM** might be the same word as in the phrase **VALAIMAS PUKLUM,** where its enclisis prevented anaptyxis (Bü. reverses the process and says that the enclisis caused syncope); the two words might mean "first-born child." Huschke and Deecke, building on this text, proposed "magic cup." But any association with *praebia* or with "first-born" equates Oscan **E** with a diphthong, possible only by borrowing from a monophthongizing dialect. I suggest that **PREBAIAM** is a proper name, the feminine to a gentilicium with the ending shown in Oscan **MARAHIS,** Latin *Annaea, Poppaea,* etc.

The theft must have been one of some consequence, to be the basis for such a curse. Huschke and Deecke think of a magic cup which, to increase its importance, they conjectured to belong to a temple; the others assume the theft of a slave. I have returned to a suggestion of the first editor. The child, be it noted, does not bear Vibia's name, but the feminine gentilicium of (presumably) its father. As for the form **PUkULUM,** the apparent anaptyxis may be explained as already stated, or may be a mere dittography, since **U** and **L** in the Oscan alphabet were often indistinguishable when carelessly written, as in this tablet.

3. **DAdaD:** as Oscan **dād* is the equivalent of Latin *dē*, this verb is the equivalent of *dēdere* rather than of *reddere,* though the ultimate meaning is the same.

4. **ULAS:** Bü. De. Pa. Con. *sepulcri*, H. *Orci;* Bg. vPl. Bk. *illius*, which seems to me far better.

4. **SVAI NEIP DADID:** unlike all previous editors, I have ended the sentence after this clause; thus the preceding sentence is motivated. Buck begins a sentence with this clause, and, with Danielsson, does not end it after **LAMATIR;** Huschke begins his sentence likewise, but makes **LAMATIR** a participle, belonging in the clause; all others end the sentence after **LAMATIR.** Von Planta, in closing the sentence here, was influenced by his desire to find plurals in the verbs in **-ATAR** in 5, which requires a change of subject from the singular in **LAMATIR.**

4. **LAMATIR:** "let him be sold into slavery," according to Bü. Bg. De. Pa. vPl. Con.; *obstinatus*, H.; *caedatur*, Dan. Bk. (cf. page 238 n.), whose view I adopt.

4. **DUNTEis:** Bü. *mortui*, cf. δύντος; Bg. Pa. vPl. *devoti*, as though **dōnĭtī;* H. *potentiae*, cf. δύναμις; De. *dentis*, cf. ὀδόντος; Dan. **DENTEs,** *dentibus*. Accepting Bugge's meaning, I think that instead of its being equivalent to **doniti*, which requires a shift in the formation, the word might be the regular development of (the equivalent of Latin) *dŏmĭtī*, the root of which is perhaps to be recognized in **DAMI***Ad* 2 and is further utilized by me for the conjectural **dumatir** at the end of this line.

5. **KAISPATAR:** Bü. *caedatur;* Bg. *caespitibus tegitor;* H. *febri conficitor;* De. *caesus sit;* Pa. *virgis caedatur;* vPl. *caespitantor;* Bk. *glebis tundatur.* **KRUSTATAR:** Bü. Pa. Bk. *cruentetur;* Bg. *glebis tegitor;* H. *frigore conficitor;* De. *contritus sit;* vPl. *cruentantor.*

In these two difficult verbs, I incline to find, with Bugge, denominatives to ***kaispā*** and ***krustā.*** Bugge makes the former an equivalent of Latin *caespes*, comparing the doublets *palma* and *palmes;* ***kaispaum*** means "to cover with sods," even as *humare* means "to cover with earth." ***Krustaum*** I take, almost like Bugge, as a direct equivalent of Latin *crustare*, "to cover with a layer or crust," whence it might mean "to incase in earth, to bury." The four verbs of the sentence then form a logical succession: "that he be flogged, be killed, be covered with sods, be buried."

As to the form, whose difficulty lies in the **A** of the final syllable, I wish to offer an explanation which to some extent is different from those heretofore set forth. The second and third persons singular of the future imperative of the first conjugation ended in *-ā·tōd;* the

second singular of the present imperative ended in *-ā*. The *r*-passives of the two would be, respectively, *-ātōr* and *-ār*; and the two might have been contaminated to *-ātār*, especially as the *-ār* second person imperative was ambigouus with the third person indicative passive of the type wherein *r* replaces the final *t* or *d* of the active. But specimens of all these forms are either extremely rare or non-occurrent in the extant remains of the Italic dialects.

5. **SVAI NEIP:** all previous editors have taken this with the following. I take it with the preceding, for reasons already given; it repeats the **SVAI NEIP DADID** of line 4, which is similarly attached to the end of its sentence.

5. **AVT:** all previous editors take as meaning *aut*, except Deecke, who interprets *ast*. The word is found in the Cippus Abellanus, the Tabula Bantina, two of the *jovila*-inscriptions, and in the inscription of Bovianum, in all of which it means *at, autem*, while *AUTI* in the Tabula Bantina means *aut*. Only in the present inscription is **AVT** taken to mean *aut*. Though the material is not overabundant, still it is possible that **AVT** is here also to be taken as *at, autem*, except where we have it doubled as a correlative, in line 12, and in 5-6, in which the prior occurrence is a restoration. This view I adopt.

5. **SVAI**: virtually like German *wenn*, combining the idea of condition and that of future time.

5. **TIIUM:** nom. sg. according to all but Bugge, who makes it acc. sg.

5. **FIFIKUS:** Bü. Bg. Pa. vPl. Bk. *decreveris;* H. *defixeris;* De. Con. *fixeris*. While the word may denote the magical act of the *defixio*, it is more reasonable that it indicates the assent of Ceres to the prayer and her conversion of the entreaty into a reality.

5. **PUST EISuk:** referring to the idea of the preceding clause.

5. **kahad:** vPl. was the first to recognize that this form was a subjunctive rather than an indicative; the Latin version is, of course, to be justified as expressing a generalized condition. Its meaning is variously rendered, since it has two uses in this inscription: *capere* (Bü. De. Pa. vPl. Con. Bk.), *incohare* (Bg. Pa.), *parare* (Bg.), *desiderare* (H)., *concipere* (De.,) *suscipere* (Con.), *incipere* (Bk.); *parare* seems to me to fit both uses most acceptably.

6. **PUNUM:** Bréal recognized that the dots in **PUN:UM** were

an error, and that **UM** was not a separate word, though Bü. and De. rendered it *votum*, and H. rendered it *igitur*. Bréal recognized the generalizing **-um**, Bg. and Con. render *umquam*, Pa. vPl. Bk. render it "whenever" (with different Latin words). The last view I adopt.

7. **NIP . . . . NIP:** the relation of this negative to the **NEIP** of lines 4, 5, 6, is puzzling. It is found only in this line and in the next; and in both lines it is repeated, showing use as a correlative. This may be the explanation, for **NEIP** is not used either here or elsewhere as a correlative. On the other hand, **NEP** is found in correlative use regularly, and that problem of differentiation still remains.

7. **AISUSIS:** I take this, with Bü. (and Bk.; vPl. *dis* or *sacrificiis*; Con. dat. or abl. pl.) as ablative, with modifying adjectives. Bg. Pa. *sacrificia*, H. *hostiae* (*oblatae*), De. **AISUS IS,** *sacrificia eius*, all as subject of **PUTIIANS.**

7. **UFTEIS:** with Bg. *optati* or the like, depending on **PIDUM;** so vPl. Bk.; and virtually H. *voti*. De. Pa. *preces*, nom.; Con. gen. sg. of ptc. or acc. pl. of *i*-stem, *spes, vota.*

7. **PAI:** almost certainly the accusative with the passive **KARANTER,** like the similar usage with Latin *vescor pascor depascor*, rather than governed by a preposition at the end of the preceding line (mentioned as alternative possibility by Bü. and accepted by H.), since the proper substitute is an ablative of means, as with those Latin verbs.

9. **SULUH:** Bü. H. vPl. *denique*, but better Bg. De. Pa. Bk. *omnino;* Con. *penitus.*

9. **TURUMIIAD:** variously rendered into Latin, though the sense is evident. There is only the question whether it should be associated with *torquere* and *tormentum*, as Bugge suggested, or with *torpescere*, an alternative suggestion of von Planta (I, 384 n.). The former view is more in keeping with the preceding context, which this verb sums up.

10. **VIBIIAI AKVIIAI:** the latter of these names seems to be a gentilicium, equal to Latin *Acuvia*,[1] though only Deecke so translates it; Conway refers to the Campanian gens *Aquuia* (II, 596; I, 163). All others give "Aquia" as their Latin translation, though I can find no occurrence of this name. **VIBIIAI,** despite the doubled **I,** must be a

[1] Cf. vPl. I, 347; Schulze, *op. cit.*, pp. 68, 550.

praenomen, corresponding to the masculine **VIBIS** found in a number of Oscan inscriptions.

11. **HUNTRUS:** though Bü. perceived the meaning, it remained for Bg. to separate the words properly, and for De. to connect the form and the meaning. But even von Planta's conjecture (II, 629 n.) on the form is rather unsatisfactory, for an original form in *-ō* is non-existent in Italic, and *-ōd* with *s* attached as in Latin *abs* would give ***huntruz.** Possibly the accusative plural, meaning *ad inferos* (as Bg. interpreted the word), developed to a merely adverbial and prepositional function; **TERAS** is then a genitive singular, not an accusative plural. The same explanation would hold for **SUP*R*us** in line 10.

12. **AVT KERI . . . . *A*VT . . . . LEGINEI:** dative of agent with the following verb, unless the alternative restoration of line 11, mentioned above, is to be credited. The agent construction happens not to occur in the extant remains of the Italic dialects, so that there is no valid argument against the possibility that it was expressed by the dative, even as it was in Latin with the gerundive and often with the perfect participle. Here, my restoration includes a participle, **TUSz.**

12. **TRUTAS:** it is more likely that this word means "fourth," as Bg. and Bk. take it, than that it means "definite, fixed," as Bü. thought; vPl. and Con. are non-committal as between these views, and others are erratic or offer no interpretation.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA